



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/401,892	09/23/1999	Stuart Serkin	09857/031001	5283

26161 7590 01/14/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
225 FRANKLIN ST
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

JASMIN, LYNDIA C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

17

APPLICATION NO/ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------


01122005

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Attached is a copy of the last page of the Examiner's Answer to Appeal Brief dated May 04, 2004 with all the conferees initials.


Lynda Jasmin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3627
1/12/05

Group VII (claim 17)

Appellant repeats the arguments of Group I, which are addressed above.

Group VIII (claims 18 and 19)

Appellant argues that neither the Federal Register nor Biaise et al teach the step of routing the market liability order to the market participant next in queue whom would be locked and execute the order at the price of the locked quote. Examiner maintains that under the combination of the Federal Register and Biaise et al, this step is anticipated. If the quote remains locked or crossed, this is detected and it is inherent that the steps of the Federal Register and Biaise et al are repeated.

Group IX (claims 20 and 21)

Appellant repeats the arguments of Group VI, which are addressed above.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



bj
April 17, 2004

Conferees
Eric Stamber
Jim McClellan




DENISE G MALONEY
FISH & RICHARDSON PC
225 FRANKLIN ST
BOSTON, MA 2110-2804